

Serial No. 09/522332

- 11 -

Art Unit: 2143

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-11 and 13-34 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 8-15, 20-26 and 31-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonnell. Claims 4-7, 16-19 and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonnell in view of Susilo. Claims 1 and 11 are currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 distinguishes Bonnell because the manner in which network traffic is processed by the network device is reconfigured. The OA suggests that this feature is taught in Bonnel in the Abstract, Figures 2 and 25, and at Col. 2, lines 48-51. However, the Abstract fails to mention any such reconfiguration, or even use the term "reconfiguration" or even a synonym thereof for any purpose. Rather, discovery, monitoring and recovery actions are described. Similarly, Figures 2 and 25 fail to illustrate any sort of reconfiguration. To the contrary, Figure 25 explicitly shows that the only actions are monitoring and notification (which is consistent with the Abstract). Finally, the passage at Col. 2, lines 48-51 states "graphical user interface module 50 coordinates the representation of pop-up windows for command menus and the display of requested or monitored data." Clearly, there is no discussion in that passage of reconfiguring how the device processes network traffic. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 based on Bonnell is therefore requested.

Claim 11 distinguishes Bonnell because the manner in which network traffic is processed by the network device is reconfigured. The OA suggests that this feature is taught in Bonnel in the Abstract, Figure 25, and at Col. 6, lines 61-67, col. 7, lines 1-14, and col. 16, lines 3-5. The lack of teaching of reconfiguration in the Abstract and Figure 25 have already been discussed

Serial No. 09/522332

- 12 -

Art Unit: 2143

above. The passage at Col. 6 states that a network management computer monitors and manages resources. However, the follow-on passages in col. 7 and col. 16, and particularly the paragraph at col. 7, lines 31-44, describe that "management" is nothing more than discovery, monitoring and recovery actions. In other words, no device in Bonnell is ever actually reconfigured to process traffic differently. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 based on Bonnell is therefore requested.

Claims 22, 31 and 32 also distinguish Bonnell because the manner in which network traffic is processed by the network device is reconfigured. With regard to those claims, the Figures and passages already discussed above are cited as teaching the reconfiguration feature, and fail to teach that feature for the same reasons already discussed above. Withdrawal of the rejections of claim 22, 31 and 32 is therefore requested.

Claims 2-7, 9-10, 13-21, 23-30 and 33-34 are dependent claims which further distinguish Bonnel, both alone and in view of Susilo, and which are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of those claims is therefore also requested.

Serial No. 09/522332

- 13 -

Art Unit: 2143

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-4001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

July 15, 2005
Date

H. A. A.
Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Steubing McGuiness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-467
Dd: 07/21/2005